



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

missible as it is to call men into the ranks of the army whose pay is fixed at only \$30. per month, no limit as to hours, and with anything like a strike punished as mutiny.

Such a condition would mean real thoroughgoing preparedness and efficiency. Nothing stands in the way of it but the timidity of politicians, which, to the great detriment of the country, was in glaring evidence at the time of the passage of the Adamson Bill. Is such timidity still sufficiently great and controlling to hamper and perhaps wholly thwart the efforts and sacrifices we are making to win the war? It will require the utmost exertion, the willing sacrifice, the unwavering courage of all classes, and the subordination of every political and selfish consideration to do it.

With every man capable of working in factory, field, shop, shipyard and munition plant declared to be in the service of the United States for the period of the war, with prices of commodities and wages fixed for definite periods at fair rates subject then to readjustment, and strikes forbidden, we should have stability of prices and wages, and an efficient democracy which no Power could resist.

Has Congress the courage to organize victory or shall we go limping and stumbling along as we have, wasting our resources, and not bringing to bear anything like our full strength?

It has been stated recently that 100,000 laborers are to be brought from the West Indies. There are three objections to this plan: They are needed where they are, to keep sugar production at the highest possible point; the number proposed is but a drop in the bucket; and they are well known to be nothing like as industrious, biddable and efficient as the Chinese.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

ARCHIBALD HOPKINS.

ROOSEVELT AND WILSON

SIR,—In the January REVIEW we read that: “ * * * Mr. Roosevelt’s personal following is still the greatest and most devoted in the country. We wonder sometimes whether the President appreciates how many loyal citizens feel a sense of personal tragedy in the shelving of one who must be regarded as the most generally recognized, if not actually, the foremost patriot in the land.” A letter to the editor says: “ * * * Thousands feel that the President is playing pretty small politics in studiously ignoring the Colonel.” The *Outlook*, with which for years Roosevelt was officially connected, sets forth that, to head his Cabinet, Washington chose Jefferson, a leader who “ could never have been sympathetic to him ”, that Lincoln, in the dark days of 1860, called Stanton to take the Secretaryship of War, in spite of the fact that they were opposed in politics, that Stanton had been “ bitter in spirit and insulting in form ” in expression toward him. “ Yet Lincoln chose him. But that was Lincoln.”

Washington’s purpose was to lead in building up a wise and stable democratic government. Had Jefferson everywhere been proclaiming that “ when human nature had changed and the millennium had come ” a stable government could be built up, would Washington have chosen him?

Lincoln's purpose was to put down secession and maintain the union—incidentally, he freed the slaves. Had Stanton made it known to the world as his firm belief that: "By the right of secession and slavery alone can we acquire those virile qualities necessary to win in the stern strife of actual life," had he insistently declared that slavery and secession could be done away with "when the millennium had come and human nature had changed," would Lincoln have chosen him, no matter what his efficiency, his personal following? Would not, rather, the very facts of his great influence and personal following have made Lincoln wisely refrain from increasing the influence of one bent on defeating his great purpose?

President Wilson's purpose is so to win this war that the rule of international justice may succeed to the ruinous, bloody, wasteful horrors of war, which may otherwise again be forced upon the world whenever a strong, ill-intentioned nation wishes.

Roosevelt, with almost or quite German fervor, has lauded war as war. Years ago he said: "We must play a great part in the world, and especially perform those deeds of blood, of valor, which above everything else bring national renown. * * * By war alone can we acquire those virile qualities necessary to win in the stern strife of actual life." (*The Strenuous Life*.) To-day, in spite of the incredible sufferings of the war-worn, overtaxed world, he reiterates that his hope for future peace lies in our building up an army after the war which shall be "the most efficient in the world." To the President's statement that: "In every discussion of the peace that must end this war it is taken for granted that that peace must be given by some definite concert of power, which will make it virtually impossible that any such catastrophe should ever overwhelm it again," he scornfully replied that "war might end when the millennium had come and human nature had changed."

It takes vision of a noble sort to be a leader in the changing of that same human nature, which now, as never before, is prepared for the change by universal suffering: to see that not even how long the war lasts is so vital as that it should end war. The tragical pity of it is that such a forceful natural leader as Roosevelt has not that vision; will not cast his great influence on the side of the world's desperate need—on the side of progress.

Does not the very fact of Roosevelt's great influence and personal following make Wilson wisely refrain from increasing that influence?

E. A. SMITH.

LOS ALTOS, CALIFORNIA.

HE SAW LINCOLN

SIR,—I am not, I regret to say, a regular reader of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, and I therefore do not know whether the views of those of us who regret the sending of Mr. Barnard's statue of Abraham Lincoln to Europe have appeared on your pages. From reading the communications in your December number I am reminded of the decision of Justice Sir Roger de Coverly in the litigation relative to the willow tree, which was, if I remember rightly, in these words: "Much may